

MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP:	PLANNING COMMISSION
DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:	Wednesday, February 13, 2002, 1:00 p.m., Room 113, First Floor, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska
MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:	Mary Bills, Jon Carlson, Steve Duvall, Gerry Krieser, Patte Newman, Linda Hunter, Greg Schwinn and Tommy Taylor (Cecil Steward absent); Kathleen Sellman, Kent Morgan, Stephen Henrichsen, Mike DeKalb, Duncan Ross, Mike Brienzo and Jean Walker of the Planning Department; Allan Abbott and Steve Masters of Public Works & Utilities; Dave Knopick of Gould, Evans (the Comprehensive Plan consultant); media and other interested citizens.
STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING:	Special Planning Commission Work Session on the "draft" 2002 Lincoln City/Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan, as submitted by the Comprehensive Plan Committee, dated February 6, 2002.

Chair Schwinn called the meeting to order, explaining that this is an open business meeting; however, no questions or testimony will be taken from the audience. The public hearings for public comments are scheduled for March 13th and March 27th.

Kent Morgan of the Planning staff submitted additional information received since the Plan was distributed to the Planning Commission, consisting of three emails, comments received on the Voice Mail Comment Line, "*Reflections on the Draft Comprehensive Plan, Change Recommendations*" submitted by the Friends of Wilderness Park, dated 2/10/02, and a report from eight members of the Comprehensive Plan Committee (CPC), entitled, "*Comprehensive Plan Major Remaining Issues*", dated 2/13/02, for the Commission's consideration.

Newman inquired whether the results of the surveys handed out at the open houses had been tallied. Morgan indicated that the comments were not tallied; however, the actual comments are available and he will check into getting copies for the Commission.

Newman also suggested that it is important for the Plan to somewhere list all of the committees and task forces that worked and provided input, and the decisions that they made. Morgan indicated that all of the committee work and every piece of paper that has

passed through this process has been placed on the Internet website. He could print everything for the Commission, but it is very voluminous. Newman wants the community to see all the different groups that participated.

The Commission then proceeded through the Plan.

EXISTING CONDITIONS: It was agreed that the Commission would begin with “Future Conditions” and return to “Existing Conditions” as time permits. Newman stated that she found typos and things she does not understand in the “Existing Conditions”. She noted that under “Utilities”, two whole paragraphs disappeared between draft one and draft two of the Plan dealing with recycling and environmental services. She believes it is important information that should be included. Morgan indicated that he would go back and check to see if they got removed by mistake.

VISION (V1-V2):

Carlson served on the CPC and provided background information throughout the discussion. With regard to the “Vision”, he stated that to have been the number one task of the CPC. They conducted public workshops to develop strengths and weakness and the important items. The “Vision” has been presented to the public quite a few times and he has not heard any objections. The “Vision” is intended to be the home base and everything else in the Plan grows out of the “Vision”.

FUTURE CONDITIONS:

The Region (F3)

Morgan explained that the “Long Range Regional Planning” is somewhat of a work in progress section. Lincoln/Lancaster County is part of a larger area in Southeast Nebraska for economic reasons, environmental reasons, social reasons and practical reasons. The Joslyn Castle Institute is looking at bringing together individuals and groups from the southeastern part of the State to discuss regional planning issues. It was not possible to bring that work into the Plan at this time, but the Plan does acknowledge the regional component.

Schwinn suggested that the Plan define what we mean by “sustainable communities”.

The People (F5)

Morgan explained that this section provides a description of the overall population growth and reasonable rate of growth, with an agreed upon growth rate of 1.5%, which adds over 100,000 to the county in 25 years. That growth rate became the basis for a lot of the other items in the Plan.

Duvall expressed concern about having one number as a fact. We don't know what that number is going to be. He would rather use a range.

Schwinn noted that the Plan anticipates growth of the farm population and he does not know how we could ever possibly make that assumption. Morgan explained that the CPC looked at it as a continuation of the existing pattern. Schwinn commented that more money is made between the County-City Building and the Capitol building than on the farms in the county. Schwinn is concerned because the growth rate in the 90's skewed our last Plan. He does not want the 25 year plan to be skewed. Schwinn agreed that he can live with the projected growth rate, but it seemed like the numbers are not consistent all the way through. Morgan further explained that our employment growth is 2.5%. It's a traditional pattern that we've had. The Economic Futures Task Force talked about this.

Bills is concerned because LES is still sticking to 2%. Where is the trigger mechanism she heard about so that if we saw growth happening at a faster rate we could jump in? Morgan explained that there is a "monitoring program" as opposed to trigger mechanism, that will look at indicators and we will monitor those indicators. If there are changes, we will introduce a process to look at it through the planning process and the annual review of the Comprehensive Plan. The CPC accepted these indicators unanimously. Kathleen Sellman added that this analysis would be performed annually.

Schwinn inquired whether this Plan still envisions the possibility of doing subarea plans like we've been doing the last three years. For example, if a developer were working on a subarea, they wouldn't have to wait until the annual review to submit. Morgan concurred, adding that there is a lot of new flexibility in the Plan. Allan Abbott of Public Works indicated that he is in favor of the subarea planning process because it allows for time to make adjustments.

Carlson stated that he is comfortable with the projected growth rate. Bills stated that she is comfortable as long as there is an annual review.

Duvall is still concerned about LES having their own growth projection number. Carlson observed that all city departments work in coordination with this number, except LES.

Schwinn suggested that with the built-in restructuring and the subarea planning, the population isn't all that important because we're looking at large portions of the city coming in at certain times. It sort of lets the market control the growth more than the plan.

The Economy (F9)

Morgan explained that the Economic Futures Task Force, consisting mostly of members of the business community, met for about six months. They looked at various aspects of the economy, including growth rate, population growth rate, and changes in economy. This section is primarily the product of that Task Force and what they were recommending in how we might see the future economy and the community grow.

With regard to the “Transportation System” (F11), it states that the “Rights-of-way for the South and East beltways should ‘be designated’ as soon as possible.” Schwinn wondered whether this should state, ‘designated and secured’. Abbott suggested that the transportation section clears up some of these issues. The corridors have been ‘designated’ but the rights-of-way have not. Hunter wondered about doing bond issues for land acquisition to acquire the rights-of-way. Schwinn believes it would be possible but it would take the political will to do it.

Newman stated that she is going on the assumption that the glass is half empty and what she sees from the employee standpoint is that some people still can't get to work. The Plan talks about *more* automobiles for the transportation system. She would like to see something about alternative modes meeting the demands of the growing city. People at Day Watch say they do not have means to get to work; impaired people can't get to work if the buses aren't running.

Newman also recalled that the first draft of the Plan listed employee ratios for population and she thought it was really interesting. Morgan believes that the CPC wanted that to be rewritten and wanted to downplay some of the numbers.

As far as alternative modes of transportation, Schwinn suggested that when it snows and the buses don't run, there are no alternative modes of transportation. There is really nothing we can do. Newman just wants a statement in the Plan that says something besides rights-of-way for roads. Schwinn noted that trails are referred to many times further on in the plan. What about light rail? Does the expansion of bus service belong in the Comprehensive Plan? Newman further commented that the visually impaired cannot use the handivan. Just simply putting language in here opens that up until we get to a

comprehensive special transit system that would be available to anyone. She is looking at it from an employee standpoint and believes it needs to be addressed.

Carlson agreed that there is a large number of people that depend on public transportation. Schwinn believes we need to build the living units on the transportation corridor and this is discussed in the Plan.

Abbott clarified that mass transit is not personal transit. Maybe we’re talking about some special needs that would have to be addressed by something other than mass transit.

Carlson referred to “Information Based Companies” on page F13, where it refers to “upper-middle income neighborhoods”. He believes the CPC tried to not make references to upper and middle income and suggested that this reference be deleted.

Community Forum (F17)

Morgan explained that this section focuses upon how the neighborhoods and aspects of the growth areas evolve; it includes the Land Use Maps; priority areas for aging; subarea planning; etc.

Schwinn referred to page F19 under *Guiding Principles for the Urban Environment* where it talks about “...encouraging a greater amount of commercial space per acre and more dwelling units per acre in new neighborhoods”. He noted that the Antelope Park neighborhood is not interested in increasing density in neighborhoods. He is not sure that is a viable alternative. There are no Brownfields and infill lots in Lincoln, unless Parks wants to sell some land. Obviously, we’re going through rebuilding infrastructure in certain neighborhoods. When you look at the neighborhoods, do you look at the viability of that neighborhood? Do we ever consider not upgrading a neighborhood’s sewer until we’ve blighted that neighborhood? Abbott stated that the city does not intentionally do something so that the neighborhood will deteriorate. Schwinn asked Abbott whether we are keeping up with replacing our aging infrastructure. Abbott believes Lincoln is doing as good a job as any city does. The problem with that question is we don’t see sewer so you don’t know if there is a problem. You can see a street. But the number of problems we have do not indicate that we are behind on replacing the mains. Public Works does track main breaks. We do not have a cycle that says we will replace all of our mains within a certain time. Schwinn thinks it is real important to tie together if we are going to keep our existing neighborhoods. As far as redeveloping existing neighborhoods, it was suggested that there really aren’t any neighborhoods in this city that are to the point where we could do wholesale development. We don’t have the class of Brownfields in Lincoln, Nebraska.

As far as the language Schwinn was referring to, Carlson believes this was compromised language by the CPC. The CPC voted early on in the process for 5 dwelling units per acre in any new development. There was great discussion about “mandate” versus “encourage”. He believes the CPC compromised back into encouraging and creating incentives.

Schwinn pointed out that these are the decisions the Planning Commission is going to have to make. In theory, it would be great to talk about increasing densities, but we’re also the ones that see a simple situation where we rezone the whole neighborhood because someone wants to build two duplexes. If the Commission doesn’t have the will to follow the Plan, we shouldn’t put it in the Plan.

Carlson believes there was considerable support and some public support to mandate this new threshold. There was even a subcommittee called the “density committee”. That subcommittee specifically discussed not having a mandate, and suggested using “encourage” and then work on loosening the design standards to create incentives. Schwinn believes we already have traditional neighborhood design in Lincoln at 3.7 dwelling units per acre.

In terms of *Overall Form*, on page F19, the first paragraph, Bills believes it should be linked to both demand and the market. We’re working on new subdivisions all the time and people want bigger lots and we cannot get them without replatting. Bills likes the “new urbanism” concepts and she wants to encourage it, but at the same time we have to meet market demands. We need to be careful about messing with housing affordability. Price ranges are sky rocketing and single people or young couples can hardly buy a new home because of demand and supply. She has real concerns about this. Carlson believes this is an attempt to remedy that problem and remove impediments to affordable housing. Bills thinks it is in the interpretation of how we implement it. We have to be careful not to cause house prices in Lincoln to skyrocket. Carlson does not understand how that is driving up housing if we are creating incentives by removing design impediments. Bills responded, stating that we have to have more land available. If we make it so scarce, that drives up the cost per acre before it is sold to the developer.

Carlson is just trying to figure out if we have a problem with the sentence that encourages greater commercial space per acre and more dwelling units per acre in the neighborhoods. Bills reiterated that it comes down to an interpretation of that sentence by the Planning staff and the Commission on how to implement and enforce it. Bills suggested that the Commission may want to come back to this later and do some fine tuning.

Schwinn then referred to the *Guiding Principles for Rural Environment*. He suggested changing the first paragraph:

Acknowledge the fundamental right of farm families to choose their own destiny.
Preserve the right to farm by protecting the farm over the conflicts between farms and acreages.

He wants to say that the farmers will have the right to go on and keep farming even with development around them. They must have the ultimate right. Bills agreed, adding that we must be careful about taking away value. She was on the Greenprint Challenge Committee and they talked extensively about identifying environmentally sensitive areas and purchasing that land early on. But you can't force anyone to keep it as prairie land. Those are property rights that we have as citizens and we have to be really careful. Why isn't Parks looking ahead of the game and purchasing the areas ahead of time like the schools?

Schwinn also stated that he wants to preserve the ability to “build through”.

Newman believes it is a given that someone can do what they want with their own land. This is the protection for the farmer who truly wants to remain in farming. It is absolutely critical to protect the farmer.

Schwinn reiterated that we need to preserve the right to farm by protecting the farm over potential conflicts. We need to make sure the Plan says that the rights of the farmer who is there first are going to be preserved.

Carlson agrees that people who own land have inherent property rights to do whatever on that land, but we do have zoning in the county and we have a 90 year history that it is appropriate to have zoning. There should be channels and an opportunity to make the farmer's case. The reality is that the fundamental property right is tempered by county and city zoning. Bills believes the grandfathering takes care of it. Carlson believes that anything in the County that is not zoned is considered to be AG. The purpose of the Plan is to lay the groundwork. Schwinn agreed, and that is why we need to protect the right of farm families to choose their own density and the existing farm use needs to be protected over and above the uses that come afterward.

Hunter believes that the larger issue is the environment all the way around the farms. She does not see anything in the Plan that requires developers to absolutely have to advise people that development is going in. And the conflict comes back later. It needs to be the responsibility of the developer to inform those buyers of the surrounding uses and conditions.

Bills believes the farmers have the right to control their own destiny, and we can't tell them they always have to be a farm. Carlson pointed out again that the reality is that they have AG zoning and they would have to make application for any future change.

Newman stated that her ultimate problem is that regardless of what the developer warns people, there are still people who are successful in lawsuits in this country against farmers who have been grandfathered in. Can we state it such that there is a "best practices" and the clustering aspect? Hunter believes that basically pre-existing land use has a superior right over the developer. Schwinn also pointed out that stock farms, etc., are allowed by special permit in AG zoning.

Schwinn then referred to *Residential Neighborhoods* on page F20, where it talks about ... "A range of parks, from tot-lots to ballfields, should be distributed within neighborhoods and be within walking distance (1/2 mile) of the residents." What happened to the 1/4 mile? Is this feasible? Carlson believes the CPC wanted to support the idea that walking distance is 1/4 mile, more or less, but direction came from Parks to go with 1/2 mile. Steve Henrichsen of Planning staff clarified that the Parks section talks about their goal to have one park in the middle of a square mile. In this particular paragraph, we want to encourage open space, whether public or private, within walking distance, and nationally, walking distance is recognized as 1/4 mile. Henrichsen suggested that this language possibly could be broadened. Dave Knopick, the consultant, explained that the national Parks & Recreation Association suggests that neighborhood service areas for neighborhood parks and facilities is 1/2 mile. Schwinn observed that everyone wants a ball park or soccer field 1/4 to 1/2 mile away, but nobody wants it next door. Carlson suggested that the idea is to have a paragraph that talks about being able to walk to some kind of park area.

Newman does not understand the last full paragraph on page F21, ... "The street network should facilitate calm traffic conditions, provide multiple connections within and between neighborhoods, using neighborhood development aspects such as four way intersections,..." Carlson suggested that to refer to a modified grid. Some of these are good ideas and some are expenses that maybe don't provide a considerable amount of safety. Newman inquired about a four-way intersection of residential streets. Henrichsen explained the four-way intersections of residential streets at the map. This paragraph in the Plan is an attempt toward shorter block lengths. This particular item came out of one of the subcommittees trying to encourage shorter block lengths. Shorter block lengths make it easier to walk within the neighborhood. To have shorter block lengths results in four-way intersections. If we are going to try to encourage shorter block lengths and

pedestrian orientation, we need to be looking at the use of four-way intersections. Traffic calming also uses other things such as roundabouts, narrower streets, etc. This paragraph is an attempt to find multiple connections and spread the traffic out rather than forcing all the traffic onto one street.

Schwinn then referred to pages F22 and F23 and wonders whether it is appropriate to have these sample maps in the Plan. Henrichsen explained that these maps are an attempt to provide specific examples of a lot of different ideas that were discussed. We tried to come up with an example to show how everything could fit together.

Abbott explained that the neighborhood street that comes out to meet the arterial has a median; it is right-in, right-out on some streets and leads to more traffic signals on the arterials. It is a simplified way to minimize your connections to the arterials.

The Commission then proceeded to discuss *Urban Growth Tiers* beginning on page F30. Schwinn believes that with growth projections at 1.5% and current densities, etc., Tier I should have about 35 square miles instead of 30. Over 25 years, we've already projected that this Plan will not have enough land. Morgan pointed out that we have a large amount of land in the existing city that is not developed. Schwinn is assuming the existing urban form with 2970 people per square mile. Taking that to the projected growth over 25 years, he comes up with 35 square miles to have the same urban texture that we have now. Schwinn strongly believes that 35 miles would be better, especially when you talk about preserving open space, etc. Maybe we should be looking at a lower number per square mile in the urban form.

Schwinn also has concerns about not being able to go into Tier II until Tier 1 is filled. Newman believes that is reasonable. Carlson offered that the CPC spent 6 months talking about density numbers, the historical pattern and how much land we need. The CPC came up with an original map that was actually smaller. We have factsheets that prove that three dwelling units per acre is pretty easy to accomplish. Morgan also pointed out that there has been an attempt to identify undevelopable land as well. Carlson believes there is more than enough on the map to accommodate developable density. Morgan also suggested that there are a lot of different ways to calculate it.

Bills cautioned that we're going to affect market demand and the cost of land by controlling the supply of the land with the Tier I and Tier II policies.

Carlson observed that there was large consensus on the CPC for multi-directional growth. There are existing infrastructure investments in the northwest and the southwest. Yes, the market may dictate that you want to move into Stevens Creek and south and east, but we also have existing community investment in the roads, sewer pipe and schools in the other

areas. We need to do everything we can to play off the money we've already spent. He is not saying don't go into the new area.

Hunter commented that if there is a development out there, it is probably because their market analysis has told them it would be a high sale area and they would be demanding higher dollar amounts. If the developer decides there is money to be made in an area that is completely out of range of Tier I and Tier II, that is the developer's decision. But, Schwinn pointed out that we repeatedly talk about contiguous growth. If we go east and we get to the end of Tier I, and you want to do something in Tier II, the language says we have to finish up Tier I someplace else before going into Tier II.

Bills observed that we're butting up against Cass County and they are very much more open to our business. They can have SID's. That's going to be our competition. In reality, that is how Omaha has developed the way it has developed. Yes, it is wonderful to say this is how we want the city to grow. But our competition is the surrounding counties that are going to allow SID's and keep the cost of development down.

Carlson then pointed out that there is a fixed number of dollars available to do infrastructure improvements. The priorities that we are setting are that maintenance of the built city is first, extension and utilization of what is partially built is second, and new is third.

Bills is in favor of SID's.

Schwinn favors adding more of Stevens Creek to Tier I. Carlson has been shown that there is a finite amount of dollars and it has to be done in phases. We tried to put priority areas in Tier II. Abbott explained that the cost to build the trunk line to "O" Street is somewhere around eight million dollars. Steve Masters of Public Works recalls a number closer to twenty million to get to "O" Street. Carlson suggested that it's like picking which order the puzzle pieces will come in.

Rather than a cash basis, Duvall suggested that we should be looking at making the investment ahead of time to put the infrastructure in. Carlson does not believe that SID's are the fantasy that some people think they are. Duvall believes they are a common tool.

Schwinn believes that if we build the sewer, the private capital will come to start to develop and connect to the sewer. As you start building products in there, the tax base increases for the city, so the investment of 20 million in a bond or whatever could more than likely pay for itself and beyond. In terms of services, People's Natural Gas has the most capacity on the east side of town. They have to rebuild to get into the southwest. To the

north they have nothing. Carlson suggested that it's a trade-off between all the utilities. Duvall believes we should let demand take its course. Carlson pointed out again that the city has investment in existing infrastructure of schools, roads, etc. Carlson wants to use what we're already paying for and plan to use it fully. Schwinn believes we *are* using it fully.

Schwinn posed the question, what would it hurt to add more to Tier I in the 25 year Plan? Nobody is going to do any development until we figure out a way to finance the pipe. Morgan offered that one of the big issues is infrastructure. Public Works is doing a master plan now. If you say you want an additional number of square miles in x number of years, they are going to have to figure out a way to get it there and finance it. There is a big investment of utilities, schools, parks, libraries, etc. And there are some liabilities if in fact that development doesn't take place. That is why we are trying to find a balance.

Schwinn then posed the question, if a consortium of people come in with a subarea plan in Tier II, and that subarea plan includes everything Public Works needs for the sewer, streets, etc., does that qualify to move it forward into Tier I? Morgan stated that would be possible, only if the developer is willing to pay for all the infrastructure. Abbott concurred, assuming you're talking about additional dollars coming in from outside and you can show that the city's share of what you propose is not holding up somebody else's development somewhere else.

Schwinn went back to the number of square miles of growth in Tier I. Tier I provides a total of 30 square miles of which 23 are developable. Running his math again, Schwinn only comes up with 69,000 to 90,000 people. Schwinn wants another 5 square miles in Tier I.

At this point in the meeting, Schwinn asked the Commissioners to submit any questions they have in writing to the staff by Wednesday, February 20th.

Business and Commerce (F37)

Morgan explained that this section focuses principally on commerce centers including retail office and service centers and industrial centers. This is a different approach from the previous Plan so as to allow greater flexibility for the market to move things around and give incentives to have larger centers.

Schwinn is pleased with this section. There was some discussion about the community center shown on East O at 90th to 104th. Morgan explained that it can be moved around within a fairly substantial area.

Newman suggested moving the dot just a little bit for the regional center between 56th & Cotner on "O" Street (Gateway).

Newman inquired about market impact studies. The Plan talks about community centers and regional centers not needing market impact studies, yet we require them for movie theaters. Morgan explained that this is a carryover from the existing Plan. All other market analysis regulations are being removed. Knopick agreed that it varies from community to community as far as requiring a market analysis. Newman is concerned about the danger of overbuilding.

Bills inquired whether Downtown's role is still actually the major office and service center. Morgan stated that in terms of volume and area it is still the major area. That also goes back to the *Vision* statement.

Schwinn observed that we have 10 million square feet of office space Downtown and we don't appear to have any concern about traffic in and out of Downtown. Yet, when we added 2 million square feet at Andermatt (84th & Hwy 2), we were concerned about traffic on Highway 2. He thinks it is odd that we would be concerned about high impact on Hwy 2. Morgan disagreed that we do not care about traffic Downtown. Abbott observed that there is very little to be done Downtown with the timing of lights, etc. As you develop along the fringe or arterials where you have opportunity to improve the flow, those efforts should be made. As developments occur, such as at 84th & Hwy 2, we still have the opportunity to do things to make traffic flow through there better.

Environmental Resources (F53)

Morgan explained that this section was built upon the work of the Greenprint Committee. It really came down to the language on page F57, resulting in the environmental recommendations.

Schwinn observed that achieving these goals are going to take the political will to spend the money. Nebraska currently does not have an environmental trust fund. Morgan suggested that there are any number of sources of funding but until the vision is established, you can't go out and get those funds.

Hunter inquired about the status of the city's plan to do some preservation for the Tiger Beetle. Sellman advised that the city does not have a definite response from the federal government at this time. Mike DeKalb of Planning staff advised that the feds are satisfied that we're trying to do something. We've asked for some funds. We hope to proceed with

interlocal agreements and do a local habitat study. The feds raised the red flag, which caused us to react and form a committee, and now they're probably in a wait and see mode. The Tiger Beetle has moved from #11 to #3 on the candidate list.

Residential (F67)

Morgan explained that this section is an extensive and more detailed look at the urban and rural component.

It was pointed out that the home ownership percentages are found on page E36. Newman does not see anything about the historic preservation ordinances anywhere.

Carlson referred to page F75. There are some strategies under *Strategies for Existing Residential Areas* that really should be appropriate overall. Maybe the strategy for new and existing may not necessarily need to be there. They are all strategies for the whole community.

Guiding Principles for Rural Areas (F71) provides for eight dwelling units per square mile. Bills noted the higher density in the south than in the north. Schwinn thought there was a state law that says you can put a house on over 20 acres. DeKalb stated that there is a legal opinion stating that the city and county has the right to regulate zoning and density. If you built a house today on more than 20 acres, you would not need a county building permit, but an electrical inspection and compliance with FEMA is required.

Bills understands that this change was made at the last minute. What was the reason? DeKalb stated that the discussion has been long and arduous in that the CPC couldn't reach good consensus and broke up into a subcommittee which made a recommendation and that is what was agreed upon to bring forward.

DeKalb further explained that the last three Comprehensive Plans said there should be an AG area, acreage area and predesignated acreage areas. In those plans, we did use things like farm productivity, soils, roads, and environmental features to make the distinction. This time, we had better data; we had researched a lot of other information; wetlands and grasslands were considered; and all native prairie is documented. Taking all of these things and putting them together, there are different factors in different parts of the county. The north and northwestern part of the county incorporates the better soils and poor groundwater so we suggested lower densities. To the east and southeast, you have roads, towns, better groundwater, and less soil productivity. The south and west lacks a rural water district.

Bills wanted to understand the controversy at the committee level. Carlson offered that everybody agreed on a lot of things. Everyone liked the GIS information and were pleased to have something to base the decision on. With regard to this map, some people had an objection from the philosophy that you should not favor one piece of ground over another. There are some folks that still think that all parcels should be treated the same in the county. Schwinn observed that if we treat all the parcels the same, development still has to overcome mother nature and you aren't going to be up in the north trying to do acreages when you don't have any water. DeKalb further offered that part of the discussion was whether we could have areas that are more receptive than others in a broader area.

Schwinn then referred to studying the build-through concept (F77), and inquired whether this refers to creating design standards. He would favor laying out acreages in such a manner that they would be sewerable. DeKalb explained that currently, the Commission reviews applications as to how they relate to the city. This proposed study is targeted to look at the different options of different styles of build through--whether infrastructure is in place or design guidelines or review criteria. Maybe there's a point system.

Carlson indicated that the CPC had a big problem with studying build-through. There were some people that came to the workshops that talked about the annexation problem in general. Even if we design a build through mechanism, they still want to live in the country and don't want the city to annex. Henrichsen clarified that if a developer proposes an urban subdivision next to an acreage development, it is often those acreage people that don't want to be annexed or that change in lifestyle. DeKalb observed that one of the comments was that the best build through for a developer is clean land.

Even with that map in the Plan, Carlson believes it would still be up to the County Board to decide if they want to create zoning that actually does that. DeKalb pointed out that there are 12 incorporated towns in the County. Six of them have 40's or some version of 40's. There are four that have something equivalent to acreage--2, 3, 4, 10. Carlson stated that he was leaning toward the map and the plan that reflected the science, but the County Board was not willing to do that.

Utilities (F79)

Morgan explained that this section lays out what utility services would be required to support the growth pattern--water, wastewater, solid waste, etc. Schwinn noted that this section reiterates the policy of contiguous urban growth. Morgan advised that Public Works has consultants on board to do the wastewater master plan once they know the results of the Comprehensive Plan.

Schwinn asked Abbott whether he has all the information he needs if Schwinn were to add more of Stevens Creek in Tier I. Abbott stated that Public Works would have to make adjustments to the other facilities plans. The need to expand for capacity can change as areas expand and develop. Once we find out what the question is, we can provide the information.

Schwinn further commented that we're dealing with Beal Slough currently. If we move into Stevens Creek, what is going to need to be done with the management of that waterway? Morgan stated that Public Works would go in and do some kind of watershed master plan looking at full urbanization of the entire basin. Abbott stated that Public Works is also getting people on board to do this work. It would also require information from the Corps of Engineers and NRD.

Schwinn asked Carlson about the CPC discussion regarding SID's. Carlson stated that in general, as far as water and wastewater, we have a pretty strong traditional policy of not allowing an enormous amount of pumping and he is in favor of continuing that policy. Newman wondered whether the Commission could get a report from staff on SID's. Morgan suggested that staff could have something available at the next meeting. It does get pretty complex. Henrichsen added that the Infrastructure Financing Advisory Committee was asked to investigate the various options and they did look at SID's. SID's were rejected because they exist outside of the city limits, and the Comprehensive Plan is encouraging residential and commercial development inside the city limits. Thus there is an impact in terms of property taxes because the SID would not pay property taxes. An SID would not help address our infrastructure financing issues.

Carlson asked Public Works to discuss lift stations (F81). Abbott stated that there is a policy of not going over the ridge and there is also a policy about lift stations. When you are talking about a forced main you are talking about getting by with a smaller main. If you do a forced main, we may get by with 1/4 of the size of the main being required. The down side is that you can't have a tap into a forced main. If you are going to use lift stations, you want to be sure that everyone agrees you are not going to have the ability to tap. You also use lift stations when you are going under creeks—there are places where it may make sense to use. But, once you go over the Ridge, everybody else wants to get into that.

Schwinn posed the question, what about our problems with Cheney? Abbott stated that issue to be a yes and no. If you're talking about Cheney with no other development than what is there, then you can handle that with a lift station. But once you get there, you're to the point where Cheney will want to expand and it is troublesome. Do you want to get into the precedent of how to stop it there? You can handle a certain situation but what do you open up when you do that?

Abbott further stated that going over the ridge solves an immediate small problem but creates a big problem with developing that side of the ridge.

Henrichsen added that the CPC did not have much discussion on this issue. Carlson thinks the statement about lift stations needs to be further explained or removed. Schwinn thought of it as a short term solution to annex Cheney. Abbott concurred that we do have some spot lift stations and some of them are a problem--that's why we don't like them. Schwinn thinks the caveat “where practical” covers it. But, Abbott wondered who decides what is “practical”.

In terms of capacity, Hunter inquired whether we know when the capacity of the existing treatment plants is going to be reached. Abbott stated that to be what the facilities plan is studying--when does it become more practical to develop a third treatment plant? Depending on what this Commission does with the Comprehensive Plan in opening up other areas, we will be at capacity anywhere from 8-15-20 years and another treatment plant will be necessary. However, we don't need it until people get in.

Schwinn observed that we are doing a much better job in watershed management than we were in the 40's and 50's.

Schwinn noted that the Health Department is not in favor of once-a-week garbage pick-up. Yet there are recycling services available for neighborhoods. Abbott commented that a small percentage of people use recycling.

The Commission skipped over the Mobility and Transportation section until the next work session on February 27th.

Information Technology (F125)

Morgan stated that this is a new section which has never been part of Plan and we will be the only community that has one. The Mayor's Technology Council is working toward developing some recommendations. As their recommendations come forward, the staff will have additional information for this section. This section gets the concept into the Comprehensive Plan as a component and recognizes the importance.

Schwinn believes it is important that the older areas as well as the new be wired for fiber optics. Schwinn also observed that until we have competition between Time Warner and Alltel, the community is pretty much held hostage. However, Morgan observed that the franchise does come up for review on a periodic basis. Schwinn pondered the idea of the developer being responsible for the telecommunications in the new neighborhoods.

Community Facilities (F129) - No discussion.

Parks, Recreation and Open Space (F133)

Henrichsen noted that the Parks Advisory Board recently voted to forward additional language to the Commission but the staff has not received anything yet. Henrichsen noted that page F135 talks about the approximate ½ mile radius for a neighborhood park.

Schwinn asked for an explanation of the subsection *Urban Forest (F139)*. What does the last strategy mean--"Investigate development of tree preservation regulations that encourage conservation of trees unique due to species or size."? Carlson believes this was a Parks and Recreation request and he believes it refers to some special trees in certain places. Schwinn is curious about seeing the tree preservation regulations in the subdivision ordinance and a lot of times the trees disappear because of our street design, etc. Are we going to alter our subdivision design standards to allow more green development? Hunter thought this was meant to prevent somebody from leveling the existing trees. Duvall is disappointed in a lot of those areas of tree masses because they are usually poor species of trees that are really more of a nuisance. Staff offered to get further details from the Parks Department.

Schwinn noted that the earlier draft of the Plan showed pictures of porches on sidewalks and streetscapes and he is pleased to see they've been removed.

Newman requested that staff get the accurate number of trail miles from Parks.

Historic & Cultural Resources (F141)

Schwinn knows that Urban Development is having some difficulty working through the problems with lead based paint. What is going to happen if the EPA says we can't preserve structures anymore because of lead based paint? Morgan suggested that if that happens, it will probably become a policy issue set by someone else.

Carlson stated that there was some sentiment by the CPC for strengthening some of the historic preservation activities, such as the procedure for temporary protection of historic resources if they were going to be torn down. Now, there is a six month delay. This was

to try and find a way to move faster on that. This would only apply to structures in historic districts that have gone through the process. Carlson would like to see the ordinance changed so that the structures could not be torn down.

Education (F143) - No discussion.

Financial Resources (F147)

Henrichsen explained that this language came out of the Infrastructure Financing Advisory Committee. A lot of the overall guiding principles were ones discussed by the 9 member IFS advisory group. The CPC took out one principle, “minimizing impact on affordable housing”. They were interested in having a progressive rather than regressive structure. The implementation regulations for the Infrastructure Financing are anticipated to be brought before the Commission prior to conclusion of the Comprehensive Plan. There will be open houses this spring and may be before the Planning Commission later this spring or early summer.

Carlson indicated that at the CPC level, everyone was on board with trying to create affordable housing but no one had the means.

Carlson did note the comment to build 25 years worth of improvements over a 20 year period on page F149.

Plan Realization (F153)

Morgan stated that this section explains the process by which the Plan is implemented. The biggest issue is reference to the annexation policy. The existing annexation policy is recommended to stay in place. The CPC also proposes that a review of the Comprehensive Plan be conducted on an annual basis and that the annual review come forward at the same time as the CIP in order to judge the Comprehensive Plan relative to the proposed CIP.

Morgan noted that the “indicators” are missing in this chapter. The reference was left out by mistake.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m. The Work Session on February 27th will begin with the **Mobility & Transportation** (F87). Abbott requested that questions about the transportation chapter be submitted as soon as possible so that he can have answers and information available on February 27th.

The Commission was also advised that all changes by the Planning Commission to this document will have to be done through the amendment process during the voting session after the public hearings.

The Commissioners were asked to submit all questions in writing to the staff by February 20th. The staff will then have an opportunity to be prepared to discuss the questions at the February 27th work session.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Walker
Administrative Officer
Planning Department